For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARRYL ANDRES ESCALANTE,	No. C 10-00959 JW (PR)
Petitioner,) vs.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE; DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED <i>IN FORMA PAUPERIS</i> AS MOOT
RANDY GROUNDS, Warden,	
Respondent.	
	(Docket No. 4)

Petitioner, a California inmate at the Correctional Training Facility in Soledad proceeding <u>pro</u> se, seeks a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging the 2007 decision by the Board of Parole Hearings (the "Board") finding petitioner unsuitable for parole. Petitioner has paid the filing fee.

BACKGROUND

According to the petition, petitioner was convicted of four counts of attempted murder with the use of a firearm. (Pet. at 6.) Petitioner was sentenced to life with the possibility of parole in state prison on August 23, 1999. On November 1, 2007, the Board found petitioner unsuitable for parole after his third parole consideration hearing. Petitioner challenged the Board's decision by filing habeas petitions in the state courts,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

with the state high court denying review on February 10, 2010. Petitioner filed the instant federal petition on March 5, 2010.

DISCUSSION

A. **Standard of Review**

This Court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a state court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); Rose v. Hodges, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975).

A district court shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

В. **Petitioner's Claims**

Petitioner seeks federal habeas corpus relief from the Board's November 1, 2007 decision finding him unsuitable for parole on the grounds that the decision was not supported by some evidence that petitioner poses a current risk to public safety. (Pet. at 6.) Liberally construed, petitioner's claim appears cognizable under § 2254 and merits an answer from respondent.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown,

- 1. The clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition and all attachments thereto on respondent and respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on petitioner.
- 2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within **sixty** (60) days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

should not be issued. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within thirty (30) days of his receipt of the answer.

- 3. Respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files such a motion, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within thirty (30) days of receipt of the motion, and respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner a reply within **fifteen (15) days** of receipt of any opposition.
- 4. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Petitioner must also keep the court and all parties informed of any change of address.
- 5. Petitioner's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket No. 4) is DENIED as moot since petitioner has paid the filing fee.

This order terminates Docket No. 4.

May 10, 2010 DATED:

d States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARRYL A ESCALANTE,	Case Number: CV10-00959 JW
Petitioner,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
v.	
RANDY GROUNDS, Warden	,
Respondent.	
I, the undersigned, hereby cert Court, Northern District of Cal	ify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District lifornia.
hereinafter listed, by depositin	, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the (ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) g said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into acle located in the Clerk's office.
Darryl Andres Escalante K-35. Correctional Training Facility P. O. Box 689 Soledad, CA 93960-0689	540
Dated: 5/13/2010	
	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk /s/By: Elizabeth Garcia. Deputy Clerk